

REMARKS**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

The Examiner rejected the claims as being obvious over Setagowa, Watkins, and U.S. Patent 6,415,101 issued to deCarmo that describes a method and system for scanning and displaying multiple view angles formatted in DVD content discussed previously.

In response to the Applicant's previous response (Amendment E (RCE) mailed October 11, 2005), the Examiner states that claim 22, "discloses that the first segment or the second segment corresponds to the same one point in time, so clearly, applicant's invention refers to the primary or secondary view that corresponds at that one point in time, i.e., multiple angles..". The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner on his interpretation of claim 22 since at no point does claim 22 recite or even remotely suggest that the first and the second segments corresponds to the same point in time. On the contrary, claim 22 clearly teaches a method that permits a user to select a point in time from which to initiate playback of an audio/video program. More specifically, claim 22 recites,

"permitting a user to select a point in time occurring during playback of an audiovisual (A/V) program from which to initiate displaying said A/V program".

The selection of the point in time from which to initiate displaying the A/V program is based upon a user selection of either the first or the second segment each of which corresponds to a different point in time. Therefore, the point in time from which to initiate displaying the A/V program is based upon the first point in time corresponding to the first segment or the second point in time corresponding to the second segment. The Applicant has amended claim 22 to more clearly describe this distinction. More specifically, claim 22 has been amended to read,

"playing audio of a second segment of said A/V program while displaying video of said second segment of said A/V program, wherein said second segment corresponds to a second point in time occurring during normal playback of said A/V program that is different from said first point in time".

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In this way, the Applicant believes that claim 22 and all claims dependent thereon are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 in view of the cited references.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite,

"an input to receive the audio and video datastream, said datastream comprising information for a plurality of different presentations of a video and an associated audio track wherein each of the plurality of different presentations are independently actionable by a user..."

In contrast to deCarmo, the invention teaches that each the presentations are independently actionable by a user and therefore there are no primary or secondary views as required by deCarmo. In particular, the Examiner cited column 2, lines 17 - 27 of deCarmo that clearly require a primary and remaining view angles that are subordinated to the primary view. In deCarmo, any modifications to the primary view similarly affect all of the subordinate views (lines 22 - 23 column 2). In contrast, the invention provides for direct selection of any of the displayed views without designating any as being a primary or a secondary view since all displayed presentations are independent of each other. In this way, the invention provides for direct selection of a desired presentation without, as required by deCarmo, redefining a desired view as the primary view, which only then responds to a user provided command (such as a selection event).

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Michael J. Ferrazano  
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300

GENSP044

9